

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 are rejected. Claims 2, 12 and 13 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are amended. New claims 14-16 are added. Claims 1, 3-11 and 14-16 remain.

Applicants request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,876,645 issued to Guey et al. ("Guey").

It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has amended claim 1 to contain the limitations of claim 2. Therefore, Applicant asserts that amended claim 1 is allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection for claim 1 is respectfully requested.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 8 is rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Guey as applied to claim 1 above. Applicant's claim 8 directly depends on amended claim 1. As asserted above, claim 1 as amended, is allowable. Therefore, it follows that claim 8 is now allowable for the same reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for claim 8 is respectfully requested.

B. It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 12 and 13 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Guey in view of U. S. 6,690,735 issued to Maddiotto et al ("Maddiotto"). Applicant has cancelled claims 12 and 13. Therefore the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections are moot.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's assertion that claims 2-7 and 9-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 1. Applicant has added claim 14, which includes the limitations of previously presented claim 1 and the limitations of claim 5. Therefore, new claim 14 is allowable. Additionally, Applicant has added new claims 15 and 16 that depend on new claim 14. New claims 15 and 16 correspond to original claims 6 and 7.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 2-11 and 14-16, as they now stand, are allowable for the reasons given above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely 1, 3-11 and 14-16, patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees. If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: April 21, 2006

By: _____

Steven Laut, Reg. No. 47,736

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on April 21, 2006.

Jean Svoboda